



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3234562

83 Copse Wood Way, Northwood HA6 2TX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Shah against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 7250/APP/2019/746, dated 22 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is an outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an outbuilding to the rear at 83 Copse Wood Way, Northwood HA6 2TX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 7250/APP/2019/746, dated 22 February 2019 and subject to the conditions set out in Schedule 1.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The development has already been partially constructed but was not complete at the time of my site visit. For the avoidance of any doubt I have based my decision on the plans submitted with the application which depict the building in its finished state.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is currently under construction and the dwelling, once completed, would be a 2-and-half storey building. The outbuilding has been partially constructed to the rear of the garden with much of the exterior work to the building not started. The garden itself is relatively wide and very deep and is a similar size to the gardens for the other dwellings within the street.
6. The footprint for the outbuilding is considerably smaller than that of the host dwelling and, once completed, it would be a single storey building that would appear proportionate to the to the scale of the main house. A substantial

garden area would be retained and the presence of the structure would not substantively alter the prevailing character of the area which is made up of large houses set within generous gardens.

7. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (SPD) recommends that outbuildings with flat or mono-pitched roofs should be no higher than 3m. The parties agree that the proposal would be 3.25m high when completed. Despite this marginal difference, due to the size of the garden and the location of the outbuilding away from the host dwelling the additional 0.25 metres has a very limited effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area. The scale of the structure is proportionate to its location to the rear of the dwelling out of sight from the public domain. As such does not harm the character or appearance of the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character.
8. The outbuilding has not been completed and it is proposed to be clad in timber and as such it would blend into the trees to the rear. Timber is a common material used in the construction of outbuildings and its use here would contribute to the subservient appearance of the outbuilding.
9. Timber decking is proposed round three sides of the outbuilding along with fencing that would be around 1 metre tall. The decking would not be overly visible from the dwelling and it is not uncommon for areas of decking to be built at the rear of the garden to create a patio area. The inclusion of this decking area around the outbuilding would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling.
10. Therefore, whilst the outbuilding would be slightly taller than is advised in the SPD, due to its size and location it would appear subservient and proportionate to the host dwelling. Additionally, due to the design and siting of the outbuilding, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character. Consequently, the proposal would not be contrary to policy BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), policy BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved IDP Policies (2012) and the SPD.

Other Matters

11. A large area of glazing is proposed on the side of the outbuilding and smaller window is proposed on the opposite side. The space for these windows has been left open within the outbuilding and as such it is possible to consider the impact their inclusion would have on the neighbouring properties. These two windows would face towards the gardens of the two neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, due to the height and location of the outbuilding, the presence of trees and shrubs and the distance from the main houses, I am satisfied that this would not result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupiers.
12. A previous application was refused due to the impact upon protected trees within the vicinity of the structure. An Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) was submitted with the current application and the Council is satisfied that the measures put forward within it will be sufficient to mitigate against any harm to protected trees. I see no reason to take a different view and have attached an

appropriately worded condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the AMS.

Conditions

13. The Council have suggested 4 conditions and I have reworded them for clarity. In addition to the tree protection measures, I have removed the standard time limit condition for commencement because work has already started and as such it would not be necessary. A condition is necessary to ensure the development complies with the submitted plans in the interests of clarity. A condition to ensure that the external materials are in line with the details submitted on the application form and approved plans is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

Schedule 1

- 1) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed: Drawing Nos: P101; P102 Rev A; P103 Rev B; P202 Rev B; P201 Rev B.
- 2) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the details set out in the application form and approved plans using the following materials: external walls, proposed timber cladding; roof, in GRP with aluminium profile finish; windows, white aluminium double glazed windows to match main dwelling and doors, white aluminium double glazed doors to match main dwelling.
- 3) No further work shall be carried out on the approved development other than in complete accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement contained at chapter 11 and the Tree Protection Plan ref: TH/A3/1892/TPP contained at appendix 9 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (Ref: TH1892), dated 06 February 2019, prepared by Trevor Heaps Arboricultural Consultancy Ltd.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the protective fencing shall be retained in position until development is completed.

The area within the approved protective fencing shall remain undisturbed during the course of the works and in particular in these areas:

- a. There shall be no changes in ground levels;
- b. No materials or plant shall be stored;
- c. No buildings or temporary buildings shall be erected or stationed.
- d. No materials or waste shall be burnt; and.
- e. No drain runs or other trenches shall be dug or otherwise created, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.